



UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

The December meeting of the University Faculty will be held on Monday, December 3, 2001, beginning at 5:00 PM in the Langone Center Forum. Professor Michael Payne will preside. If there are any amendments to the November 5 or 13, 2001 minutes, please send them to Andrea Halpern, Secretary of the Faculty, in advance of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Amendments to November 2001 minutes

2. Announcements and remarks by the President and members of his staff

Question. In the not too distant past, faculty members used to be invited to submit and update a selected list of their publications for display on a Bucknell web page which was organized for this purpose. In addition, the Bucknell public relations office used to produce "Checkpoint," the monthly newsletter which accompanied salary receipts and informed faculty and administrative staff about the scholarly and administrative achievements of their colleagues. Both these valuable means of representing aspects of scholarly and administrative excellence at Bucknell, to internal and external constituencies, have been discontinued without any widely circulated explanation. Might the faculty be provided with the rationale for the demise of this official academic web page, and "Checkpoint"?

3. Announcements by the Chair of the Faculty

Report on the planning process

4. Old Business

Report from Personnel Committee: Kim Daubman

The Committee on Faculty and Academic Personnel (FAPC) met several times to respond to the mandate in the Peeler-1 motion passed at the last faculty meeting which stipulates that faculty will be evaluated for merit using 3-point scales. Specifically, we wrote operational definitions for these 3-point scales for the faculty's consideration. In the process of developing these definitions, we encountered issues we believe to be problematic. Because of this, we are presenting to the faculty three different options to consider. One option is to adopt 3-point scales in each of the three evaluation areas with the operational definitions we have written. Another option is to adopt 4-point scales. Finally, another option is to retain 5-point scales, with modified definitions. We provide a table of comparisons among these three options below.

By a majority vote, FAPC favors the option of 5-point scales. We would endorse, however, the option of 4-point scales. The majority on the committee, however, believes that the option in which faculty would be evaluated on 3-point scales is unsatisfactory and should be rejected.

According to the Peeler-1 motion mandating 3-point scales, a rating of "2" in any given area would normally be received by "the large majority of faculty" and would be indicative of "high caliber" work. A rating of "1" would "indicate significant shortcomings in any given category" and a rating of "3" would "denote

extraordinary" achievement. At the last faculty meeting, Professor Peeler acknowledged "that a '1' in a given category would probably be more frequent in the Peeler (3-point) system" than in the system using 5-point scales proposed by the FACP at the October faculty meeting.

The operational definitions for the 3-point scales are presented in the following tables. Notice that we expect that approximately 65% of faculty (i.e., a large majority) would receive a "2" in any given category, approximately 20% would receive a "3" and 15% would receive a "1". One of the disadvantages to the Peeler-1 motion is that the proportion of faculty who can receive any given rating is somewhat constrained. This is also true of our current system and implies that relative comparisons among faculty will need to be made, a point that most faculty appear to find objectionable about our current system. The original FACP proposal (presented at the October faculty meeting) and the current 5-point and 4-point options described below would eliminate relative comparisons and, instead, evaluate faculty against a fixed standard.

Another difficulty with the 3-point scale, especially perhaps as it pertains to teaching, is that there is a gap between the definition of "2" as "excellent" (synonymous with "high caliber," the phrase used in the Peeler-1 motion) and of "1" as "significant deficiencies." It seems to us to be more reasonable to have an intermediate, transitional category, such as, for example, a category defined as "effective teaching, but one or more areas indicate a need for improvement." In such a system, only those with truly serious deficiencies would receive a rating of "1." Similarly, with 3-point scales, faculty would receive a "1" for scholarship if they had only works in progress. In the 4-point and 5-point options, a "2" would be given to these faculty and a "1" would be reserved for those who had a scholarly program evidenced only by what was presented in the personal statement. Finally, in a 3-point system, faculty would receive a "1" for service if they engaged in little or no service beyond what was expected of department members. In the 4-point and 5-point systems, a "1" would be reserved for those who did not fulfill some expectations of departmental members. In short, if 3-point scales are used, more faculty will receive the lowest rating. We think that it is preferable to reserve the lowest ratings for cases in which there are truly serious deficiencies.

Finally, we believe that the 3-point system provides little opportunity to reward the range of faculty performances. This is a violation of the principle which most faculty appear to endorse that rewards should be in proportion to accomplishment. Out of the three options, a 5-point system accomplishes this best.

At the December faculty meeting, FACP intends to move that the faculty adopt the 5-point system as operationalized below. If this motion fails, we intend to move that the faculty adopt the 4-point system as operationalized below. If this motion fails, we intend to move that the faculty endorse the operational definitions for the 3-point systems, also shown in the tables below.

Teaching

5	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness, and substantial pedagogical enhancement or curricular development.	4	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness that may include substantial pedagogical or curricular development.	3	Evidence of extraordinary achievement in classroom effectiveness that may include substantial pedagogical or curricular development. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
4	Evidence of excellence in classroom effectiveness and some pedagogical enhancement or curricular development.	3	Evidence of expected excellence in classroom effectiveness and some pedagogical enhancement or curricular development.	2	Evidence of expected excellence in classroom effectiveness that may include pedagogical or curricular development. Common (approx. 65%)
3	Evidence of consistent classroom effectiveness and some pedagogical enhancement or curricular development.				
2	One or more areas of teaching performance indicate a need for improvement.	2	Effective teaching, but one or more areas indicate a need for improvement.	1	Significant deficiencies in teaching effectiveness. Uncommon (approx. 15%)
1	One or more areas of teaching performance indicate serious deficiencies.	1	Serious deficiencies in teaching effectiveness.		

Scholarship

5	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments.	4	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments.	3	Outstanding scholarship as evidenced by significant contribution(s) that may include books, successful grant proposals, peer-reviewed articles, performances, exhibitions of artistic works, or other exceptional scholarly accomplishments. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
4	Active scholarship as evidenced by achievement within a peer-reviewed process. Publications or shows, or other comparable activity.	3	Active scholarship as evidenced by presentations, publications, shows, or similar productivity, which occurs in a peer-reviewed or comparable process.	2	Active scholarship as evidenced by presentations, publications, shows, or similar productivity, which occurs in a peer-reviewed or comparable process. Common (approx. 65%)
3	Scholarly program as evidenced by some achievement within a peer-reviewed process.				
2	Scholarly program as evidenced by personal statement of research program and works in progress; no engagement in a peer-reviewed process. Little progress since previous review.	2	Scholarly program as evidenced by works in progress.	1	Scholarly program as evidenced by works in progress or personal statement. Uncommon (15%)
1	Scholarly program evidenced only by a personal statement.	1	Scholarly program evidenced only by a personal statement.		

Service

5	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental activities.	4	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental activities.	3	Extraordinary record of service and leadership within University and/or departmental activities. Uncommon (approx. 20%)
4	Participation in more than one major service activity or leadership in at least one University or departmental activity.	3	Significant engagement in University and/or departmental service.	2	Significant engagement in University and/or departmental service. Common (approx. 65%)
3	Engagement in University and departmental service beyond that required of all members of a department, including at least one major service activity.				
2	Little or no engagement in service beyond that expected of department members.	2	Little or no engagement in service beyond that expected of department members.	1	Little or no engagement in service beyond that expected of department members (e.g., attending department meetings and participating in departmental committees). Uncommon (approx. 15%)
1	Little engagement in University and/or departmental service. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (e.g., attending department meetings and participating in departmental committees).	1	Little engagement in University and/or departmental service. Does not fulfill some expectations of departmental members (e.g., attending department meetings and participating in departmental committees).		

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of the committee members (Alison Draper, Doug Allen, Manuel Delgado, Meenakshi Ponnuswami, Steve Bowen, Beth Cunningham, and Jim Orbison) and also Mark Padilla, and publicly thank them for the extra hours they have worked on this issue over the last few weeks.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Daubman, Chair

5. New Business

a) Report from Committee on Planning and Budget: Bill King

Recommendations on comprehensive fee and faculty/staff salary increases for FY03

b) Report on the Board of Trustees Educational Policy Committee meeting: Mary Beth Gray (Faculty Representative)

The new Chair of the Committee, Scott Nichols, opened the meeting by reviewing the charge of the committee. He made a special point of noting that this committee has the responsibility to consider proposals for awarding honorary degrees. All recommendations for new appointments, tenure, retention, and promotion were approved. Steven Bowen, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs was tenured and appointed the rank of Professor of Biology. The remainder of the meeting centered on a presentation on faculty recruiting, development and retention by Provost Bowen, with assistance from Interim Deans Orbison and Padilla. The

presentation was designed to point out some of the strengths of the faculty body and the challenges we face as we endeavor to keep abreast of the latest pedagogical methods, maintain competitive research programs and otherwise contribute to the Bucknell community.

Of particular note, in 2000-2001, 55 faculty searches were conducted: 24 for tenure track faculty and 31 for temporary appointments. Steve Bowen expressed an interest in becoming less dependent on temporary faculty in the future. Mark Padilla shared a list of reasons given for turning down job offers at Bucknell or for leaving Bucknell. The reasons are varied but include personal relationship conflicts, our location, and course load.

c) Report from the Committee on Instruction: George Exner

1. CoI was copied a memo from the Committee on International Education regarding the need for safety and security plans for several Bucknell abroad programs. We support the memo and conveyed that support to its original recipients, the President and the Provost.

2. CoI has supported, in principle, a request from BSG for Bucknell to move to a system of on-line course registration. Further discussion, and a demonstration for CoI, will occur next semester.

3. CoI is nearing completion of its document concerning **assessment of student learning** and advising. This document will be distributed to all faculty in the near future. **We announce an open forum for faculty** interested in responding, and sharing other concerns, to be held **in the ELC Forum on Wednesday, December 5, from 5:00-6:30 pm**. (This forum will also be publicized elsewhere.) **We encourage all departments and programs to send a representative** to the forum, and solicit as well written responses from those unable to attend.

d) Motion from Ben Marsh

Motion: The Athletics Department, in cooperation with the Committee on Instruction through its subcommittee on athletics, is requested to develop and endorse a policy about avoiding and reconciling conflicts between the academic needs of students on sports teams on the one hand, and the time demands of practices, games, and travel on the other. This policy must be consistent with the present "Policy on conflicts between regularly scheduled classes and other activities," and should be finalized by the end of the academic year.

Ideally such a policy should describe: general principles about the relative importance of sports to a student's university experience, explicit guidance on scheduling of practices during class hours, the rights of student athletes to study abroad, appropriate and inappropriate ways to influence faculty members, appropriate and inappropriate ways to influence students, methods to maintain open communication with the academic deans, methods to educate coaches and others about their obligations, methods to educate student athletes about their rights and responsibilities, and a statement of consequences for those who violate this policy.

Rationale: The athletic program needs to demonstrate that it is willing to be a fair partner in the academic project. To many faculty members the athletic program is presently too dominant, particularly in the competition for student athletes' time during academic hours. A discussion at the September meeting on this issue has been followed in November by an effort by a highly placed member of the athletic program to pressure an untenured faculty member through the Dean's office to excuse an athlete from very important class meetings. This is inexcusable, and reflects badly on the entire institution. A good policy might prevent such a problems.